

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

In re N.H., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

B213914
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. CK56995)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND
FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MONICA R.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Zeke Zeidler, Judge.

Andre F.F. Toscano, under appointment by the Court of Appeal; and Monica Romero, in propria persona for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Monica R. appeals from the February 5, 2009 order of the juvenile court following a contested hearing pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code¹ section 366.26 terminating her parental rights and ordering her child A. H. placed for adoption. We appointed counsel to represent her on appeal.

After his examination of the record, counsel has advised this court in writing that there are no arguable issues. After we notified Monica R. on April 6, 2009 that she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions she wished us to consider, and that failure to do so would result in dismissal of this appeal as abandoned, Monica R. filed a handwritten letter brief on May 5, 2009. In that letter, she asserts that she has taken classes, wishes to parent her child, and asks the court to return her child to her. However, she does not challenge the juvenile court's jurisdiction, or its finding the child is likely to be adopted. She also fails to assert that the evidence presented at the selection and implementation hearing established any of the enumerated statutory exceptions to adoption once family reunification has failed. (§ 366.26, subds. (b)(1), (c)(1); see *In re Celine R.* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 45, 53; *In re Marilyn H.* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 295, 307.)

Monica R.'s letter brief fails to identify any legally cognizable error in the juvenile court's February 5, 2009 order. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.)

ZELON, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

JACKSON, J.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.